



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

58
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/837,047 | 04/18/2001 | Roger Everette Sanders | 343355600028 | 9203 |

24325 7590 06/30/2005

STEPHEN D. SCANLON
JONES DAY
901 LAKESIDE AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

ROSWELL, MICHAEL

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2173

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,047

Applicant(s)

SANDERS ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Roswell

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3, 5-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Examiner's prior art screenshots of Microsoft Outlook 2000, (see Fig. 11 for copyright date), hereinafter Outlook.

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 17, Outlook teaches providing a first control that operates within a window of a graphical user interface (taught as the icons shown in the "Folder List" portion of Fig. 1), manipulating the first control to access a second control, wherein the second control includes data records (taught as the selection of one of the icons in the Folder List portion of Figs. 1 and 2, with the "Test Contacts" icon being selected in Fig. 1, and the "Calendar" icon being selected in Fig. 2, wherein the second control is presented to the user in the large right panel of Fig. 1), wherein the second control is configured to operate within the first control (taught inherently as the reliance of the second control upon the selection of the first control), wherein the data records are from a database (taught inherently as the ability to store contact information and maintain that information between Outlook sessions), and modifying at least one of the data records through use of the second control (taught as the ability to bring up a contact modification window through manipulation, e.g. double-clicking, of a contact control, shown at Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 3, Outlook teaches a pop-up window providing a menu of operations, wherein the operations are configured to perform actions on a selected data record within the second control, taught as the right-click menu of Fig. 3 for manipulating records by opening the contact modification window or deleting a selected record.

Regarding claim 5, Outlook teaches adding a new data record to the database through the use of the second control, taught as the "New Contact" window of Fig. 4, opened by double-clicking the large right panel of Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 6, Outlook teaches deleting a data record from the database through use of the second control, taught as the deletion of a selected record by pressing the "Delete" key, or through pop-up menu means, the end result being displayed at Fig. 5.

Regarding claim 7, Outlook teaches renaming a data record through use of a second control, as shown in Figs. 6 and 7.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Outlook teaches indicating selection status of a selected data record by changing the contact name font color and the color of the bar around the contact name, shown at Fig. 7, being proximate to the selected data record.

Regarding claim 10, Outlook allows for the selection of multiple data records and modifying as a group the selected multiple data records, taught as the selection of multiple records at Fig. 8, the opening of a contact edit window for each record by pressing the "Enter" key at Fig. 9, or the deletion of the selected records by pressing the "Delete" key at Fig. 10.

Regarding claim 11, Outlook teaches indicating the selection status of each selected data record at Fig. 8.

Regarding claim 15, Outlook teaches an individual selection box associated with each of the data records and operative to indicate the selection status of the associated data records, taught as changing the contact name font color and the color of the bar around the contact name, shown at Fig. 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2, 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook and Amin et al (US Patent 6,208,340), hereinafter Amin.

Regarding claims 2 and 18, Outlook teaches an interface for modifying data records that includes a first control and a second control accessed through the manipulation of the first control, wherein the second control includes data records and is capable of indicating the selection of multiple data records.

Outlook fails to explicitly teach the first control being a pull-down menu and the second control being displayed within the pull-down menu region, and including separate checkbox interface items associated with displayed data records.

Amin teaches a graphical user interface "widget" for use in many practical software applications, such as scheduling and personal data recording programs, similar to Outlook.

Art Unit: 2173

Furthermore, Amin teaches the selection of a plurality of list items from a drop-down menu (at col. 1, line 62 through col. 2, line 4), that includes the use of a checkbox interface (at col. 3, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Outlook and Amin before him at the time the invention was made to modify the data record interface of Outlook to include the graphical user interface "widget" of Amin in order to obtain software for controlling data records that contains a pull-down menu capable of selecting multiple data items through a checkbox interface.

One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of screen space conserved by a pull-down menu capable of selecting multiple data items and the multiple selection of data items itself. See Amin, col. 1, lines 52-61.

Regarding claim 4, Outlook inherently teaches storing data records, as the records are maintained between Outlook sessions. Databases and record sources are extremely well known in the art to provide for such storage, and would have been obvious to include in the inherent storage of Outlook. Furthermore, Outlook provides for dynamic record generation by allowing a user to create and modify contact information dynamically, as shown in Fig. 6. Outlook also includes the functionality to import addresses from external file sources, thus giving the capability to display data records from two or more data sources, at Fig. 12.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook and Torres (US Patent 5,317,687).

In regards to claim 13, Outlook has been shown to teach a graphical user interface comprising a first control, second control, and a plurality of modifiable data items in said second control.

While Outlook teaches such a method, the reference fails to explicitly incorporate an "overview selection status box" that indicates whether any of the data items are selected when the second control is hidden from the user.

Torres, however, discloses a graphical user interface complete with an overview selection status box (Figure 3 and Figure 4A-E).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the overview selection status box of Torres into the interface of Outlook. By utilizing a representation of selections in a single graphical metaphor as described by Torres in combination with the graphical user interface of Outlook, one would obtain an interface including an overview selection status box.

The motivation to do so is given by Torres, who states, "it is therefore one object of the present invention to represent a group of menu items in terms of a single graphical metaphor for that group" (Column 2, Lines 2-4). Torres gives further motivation when disclosing "an icon evocative of an arrangement of items permitting direct manipulation techniques for rearrangement of the group and selection of particular items from the group" (Column 2, Lines 10-14).

In regards to claim 14, Outlook has been shown to teach a graphical user interface comprising a first control, second control, and a plurality of modifiable data items in said second control.

While Outlook teaches such a method, the reference fails to explicitly incorporate a "tri-state overview selection status box" that indicates whether any of the data items are selected when the second control is hidden from the user.

Torres, however, discloses a graphical user interface complete with an overview selection status box capable of indicating multiple states (Figure 3 and Figure 4A-E).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the multiple state selection box of Torres into the interface of Outlook. By utilizing a representation of selections in a single graphical metaphor as described by Torres in combination with the graphical user interface of Outlook, one would obtain an interface including a tri-state overview selection status box or multi-state overview selection box.

The motivation to do so is given by Torres, who states, "it is therefore one object of the present invention to represent a group of menu items in terms of a single graphical metaphor for that group" (Column 2, Lines 2-4). Torres gives further motivation when disclosing "an icon evocative of an arrangement of items permitting direct manipulation techniques for rearrangement of the group and selection of particular items from the group" (Column 2, Lines 10-14). Torres also discloses description of the many states of his representation when stating, "Fig. 4a depicts a situation where no options have been selected" (Column 4, Lines 17-18), "Fig. 4c depicts in pictorial form a situation where icon ring 48 is selected and one option from stack 54 has been selected" (Column 4, Lines 27-29), and "Fig. 4d depicts a situation where two options have been selected while the icon ring itself remains selected" (Column 4, Lines 34-35).

Claims 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook.

Regarding claim 16, Outlook inherently teaches storing data records, as the records are maintained between Outlook sessions. Databases and record sources are extremely well known in the art to provide for such storage, and would have been obvious to include in the inherent storage of Outlook. Furthermore, Outlook provides for dynamic record generation by allowing a user to create and modify contact information dynamically, as shown in Fig. 6. Outlook also includes the functionality to import addresses from external file sources, thus giving the capability to display data records from two or more data sources, at Fig. 12. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize database and record source storage for maintaining the contact information between sessions. One would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of highly structural storage afforded by databases and record sources.

Regarding claim 19, Outlook has been shown *supra* to teach the inclusion of databases for maintaining contact information between sessions. Accessing a database through the use of SQL is extremely well known in the art, and would have been obvious to include in the database access of Outlook. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include SQL access to the contact information database, for the advantages of highly structured and simple access offered by SQL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 8 April 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Outlook fails to teach a second control configured to be displayed and to operate within a first control (as recited in claims 1, 12, and 17), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Outlook has been shown *supra* to teach a first control that, upon selection, gives the user access to a second control used in the manipulation of data records. As this second control is accessed through the first control, it inherently operates within the first control. Furthermore, the language of claim 1 states, "wherein the second control is configured to be displayed". The use of this language fails to recite the argued limitation of a second control displayed within a first control. Therefore, claims 1, 12, and 17 are rejected over the Outlook reference for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2173

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Roswell whose telephone number is: (571) 272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Roswell
6/20/2005



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100